	Case 2:14-cv-01512-LDG-NJK Document 17 Filed 12/09/14 Page 1 of 2
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	DISTRICT OF NEVADA
10 11 12 13 14 15	WILLIAM BRIDGE, Plaintiff(s), Vs. CREDIT ONE FINANCIAL, Defendant(s). OCase No. 2:14-cv-01512-LDG-NJK ORDER DENYING DISCOVERY PLAN (Docket No. 16)
16 17	Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's proposed discovery plan and scheduling order (Docket No. 16), which is hereby DENIED without prejudice. Plaintiff's proposed discovery plan is
18	deficient in numerous ways. First, Plaintiff represents that the parties met and conferred, but were
19	unable to stipulate to the terms for the discovery plan. Docket No. 16, at 2. Pursuant to Local Rule
20	26-1(d), the parties are to submit a <u>stipulated</u> discovery plan and scheduling order fourteen days after
21	the mandatory Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) conference. Second, Plaintiff's proposed discovery plan fails
22	to include "a statement of the reasons why longer or different time periods should apply to the case."
23	Local Rule 26-1(d). Local Rule 26-1(e)(1) establishes 180 days, measured from the date the first

defendant answers or otherwise appears, as a presumptively reasonable time to complete discovery.

When more than 180 days of discovery are sought, the proposed discovery plan must provide an

explanation as to why the parties believe additional time is required. Local Rule 26-1(d). Here,

Plaintiff requests 330 days from when Defendant filed its Answer, without providing a reason why

a longer time period should apply. Docket No. 16, at 2. Third, Plaintiff's proposed discovery plan

25

26

27

28

1	misstates Local Rule 26-4, in that it provides that requests to extend deadlines in the scheduling
2	order need only be filed 20 days before the discovery cut-off. See Docket No. 16 at 5. Local Rule
3	26-4 requires that any request to extend deadlines set forth in the scheduling order must be submitted
4	at least 21 days before the subject deadline.
5	Accordingly,
6	Plaintiff's proposed discovery plan and scheduling order (Docket No. 16) is hereby DENIED
7	without prejudice. The parties are ORDERED to meet and confer and to submit a stipulated
8	discovery plan and scheduling order, that complies with the Local Rules, no later <u>December 16</u> ,
9	<u>2014</u> .
10	IT IS SO ORDERED.
11	DATED: December 9, 2014
12	
13	
14	NANCY J. KOPRE
15	United States Magistrate Judge
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

Case 2:14-cv-01512-LDG-NJK Document 17 Filed 12/09/14 Page 2 of 2